REMARKS

In response to the Office Communication, the following is submitted in accordance with the requirements set forth under 37 C.F.R. §111(b)-(c).

Claims 1-32 have been canceled and claims 33-55 have been added to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 33-55 are pending.

Claims 1-11, 12-20, and 32 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 1-3, 5-20, and 30-32 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. Specifically, claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Warthen (U.S. Patent No. 6,584,464) in view of Machiraju et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,090). Further, claims 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Warthen and Machiraju et al. in view of Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,890,139). Still further, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Culliss (U.S. Patent No. 6,539,377) and Suzuki et al. in view of Machiraju et al. Claims 30-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Culliss and Warthen in view of Machiraju. Additionally, claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Warthen and Suzuki in view of Machiraju. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Culliss, Suzuki, and Machiraju in view of Manduley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,768,790). Claims 7, 8, 11, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Culliss, Suzuki, and Machiraju in view of Warthen. Claims 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Culliss, Suzuki, and Machiraju in view of Warner (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,655).

Newly presented claim 33 recites "...receiving a question from a computer executed application; identifying an operational context, wherein the operational context is associated with the question, and a category associated with the identified context; retrieving an answer to the question, wherein the category and the question are used to retrieve the answer; using a natural language indexing module to normalize the question if an answer is retrieved, wherein one or more superfluous words are removed from the question to determine whether another question is substantially similar to the question; determining whether the answer is associated with the

operational context and the question, wherein the question is an unanswered question if the answer is not associated with the operational context and the question, the unanswered question being logged; identifying a plurality of unanswered questions; and retrieving another answer in response to at least one of the plurality of unanswered questions." Neither Warthen (U.S. Patent No. 6,584,464), Machiraju et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,090), Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,890,139), Culliss (U.S. Patent No. 6,539,377), Manduley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,768,790), nor Warner (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,655), individually or in combination, disclose, teach, suggest, or motivate the claimed invention.

Newly presented claims 34-43 depend from claim 33 and Applicant submits that these claims are in condition for allowance for the same reasons as those stated above for claim 33.

Newly presented claim 44 recites "...receiving at least one question from a computer executed application into a question module; determining whether the at least one question is substantially similar to another question by normalizing the at least one question, wherein the normalizing the at least one question comprises removing one or more superfluous words; identifying at least one category associated with a context in which the question was received using a context module; using a knowledge module configured to identify an answer to the at least one question, wherein the answer is determined using the at least one category; providing an authoring module configured to receive input, wherein the input is used to answer an unanswered question; and logging the unanswered question using a tracking module, the tracking module being configured to identify a plurality of frequently asked unanswered questions and to generate a request for another answer to the plurality of frequently asked unanswered questions." However, neither Warthen, Machiraju et al., Suzuki et al., Culliss, Manduley et al., nor Warner, individually or in combination, disclose, teach, suggest, or motivate the claimed invention.

Newly presented claim 45 recites "...a suggestion module adapted to provide a question and answer pair in response to a request for assistance from a computer executed application, wherein the question and answer pair is configured using a category associated with the request; a context/category module configured to convert a request context to the category by searching

one or more stored context maps to determine whether a match between the request context and the category is present; and a statistics module adapted to provide a question, wherein the question includes a plurality of frequently asked questions." Neither Warthen, Machiraju et al., Suzuki et al., Culliss, Manduley et al., nor Warner, individually or in combination, disclose, teach, suggest, or motivate the claimed invention.

Newly presented claims 46-50 depend from claim 33 and Applicant submits that these claims are in condition for allowance for the same reasons as those stated above for claim 33.

Newly presented claim 51 recites "…a question module configured to receive at least one question from a computer executed application; a context/category module configured to identify at least one category mapped to a context of the at least one question; a knowledge module configured to identify an answer to the at least one question, wherein the answer is generated using the at least one category; an authoring module configured to identify an unanswered question; a statistics module configured to provide a question and answer pair associated with the category; a suggestion module configured to provide the question and answer pair in response to a request for assistance; and a tracking module configured to log the unanswered question, to identify one or more frequently asked unanswered questions, and to request another answer to the list of frequently asked unanswered questions." Neither Warthen, Machiraju et al., Suzuki et al., Culliss, Manduley et al., nor Warner, individually or in combination, disclose, teach, suggest, or motivate the claimed invention.

Newly presented claim 52 depends from claim 51 and Applicant submits is allowable for the same reasons set forth above for claim 52.

Newly presented claim 53 recites "…identifying a context associated with a computer executed application, the computer executed application being configured to receive a request for assistance; mapping the context to one or more of a plurality of categories; determining which of the plurality of categories is associated with the context; identifying a plurality of most frequently asked questions associated with one or more of the plurality of categories; and displaying the plurality of most frequently asked questions. Neither Warthen, Machiraju et al., Suzuki et al.,

11

Culliss, Manduley et al., nor Warner, individually or in combination, disclose, teach, suggest, or motivate the claimed invention.

Newly presented claim 54 recites "…determining a category associated with a question, wherein the category is based at least in part upon a web page, the web page being recently accessed and the question being associated with a request for assistance associated with a computer executed application; mapping the category to a context associated with the request to generate a context to category map, the map being stored in a repository; identifying a plurality of most frequently asked questions associated with the category; and displaying the plurality of most frequently asked questions. Neither Warthen, Machiraju et al., Suzuki et al., Culliss, Manduley et al., nor Warner, individually or in combination, disclose, teach, suggest, or motivate the claimed invention.

Newly presented claim 55 recites "…receiving a plurality of questions; determining whether each of the plurality of questions has an answer located in a knowledge database, wherein a context to category map is used to determine whether the answer is stored in the knowledge database; storing each of the plurality of questions in the knowledge database, wherein at least one of the plurality of questions is unanswered; logging the at least one of the plurality of questions that is unanswered; identifying one or more frequently asked unanswered questions; and receiving another answer from an administrative source for each of the one or more frequently asked unanswered questions. Neither Warthen, Machiraju et al., Suzuki et al., Culliss, Manduley et al., nor Warner, individually or in combination, disclose, teach, suggest, or motivate the claimed invention.

Claims 33-55 are submitted and which Applicant submit are in condition for allowance. Applicant also wishes to note that the enclosed Amendment and remarks are in full compliance with the requirements set forth in 37 C.F.R. §111 and are filed with copies of the previously submitted Request for Continued Examination, copies of which are enclosed. Applicant's arguments and newly submitted claims are compliant within the meaning of 37 C.F.R. §1.111 and fully responsive to the Office Action mailed February 22, 2007, having pointed out the

specific distinctions that render the newly presented claims patentable over the applied

references. Should the Examiner have any additional questions, please contact the Applicant's

undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott S. Kokka
Reg. No. 51,893

KOKKA & BACKUS, PC
200 Page Mill Road, Suite 103
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2022
Tel: (650) 566-9921
Fax: (650) 566-9922